

JPRS 78222

4 June 1981

# China Report

POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

No. 195

**FBIS** FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

#### NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [ ] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

#### PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Indexes to this report (by keyword, author, personal names, title and series) are available from Bell & Howell, Old Mansfield Road, Wooster, Ohio 44691.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

4 June 1981

# CHINA REPORT

## POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

No. 195

### CONTENTS

#### PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

##### SOCIOLOGICAL, EDUCATION AND CULTURE

Academician Reports Impressions of Visits to U.S. Universities (Zhou Peiyuan; RENMIN RIBAO, 2 Apr 81).....	1
'HEBEI RIBAO' Stresses Need for Population Control (HEBEI RIBAO, 6 Mar 81).....	11
Traditional Ethical Concepts in Light of Population Problem (Fei Xiaotong; RENMIN RIBAO, 26 Mar 81).....	14
Research Groups Study Ideal Population for Future (DAZHONG RIBAO, 5 Mar 81).....	17
Agricultural Backwardness Seen as Fundamental Cause of Rapid Population Growth (Lin Gang; RENKOY YANJIU, Jan 81).....	18
PLA Accomplishments in Family Planning Described (GUANGMING RIBAO, 29 Mar 81).....	24

#### HONG KONG MEDIA ON CHINA

##### PARTY AND STATE

Hong Kong Article Gives Three Students' Political Views (CH'I-SHIH NIEN-TAI, Mar 81).....	25
--	----

## SOCIOLOGICAL, EDUCATION AND CULTURE

### ACADEMICIAN REPORTS IMPRESSIONS OF VISITS TO U.S. UNIVERSITIES

Beijing RENMIN RIBAO in Chinese 2 Apr 81 p 3

[Article by Zhou Peiyuan [0719 1014 3293]: "Impressions of My Visit to the United States--Several Problems Concerning Reform of Higher Education"]

[Excerpts] Last April I led a delegation of the Chinese Academy of Sciences to the United States and attended the annual meeting of the American Academy of Sciences. Later, I was invited to attend a gathering of the American Society of Physics. In May I led a delegation from Beijing University and continued my tour. In mid-June I was a visiting professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and did research work for nearly 2 months. Afterward, I went to Canada to attend an international symposium on theoretical and applied mechanics. After the conclusion of the meeting, I paid visits to [three] universities in Canada. On my way back home, I accepted an invitation from the Greek Government to visit the University of Athens. I returned to Beijing in the middle of September. I spent most of my time abroad in universities. I successively visited 21 universities, including 17 in the United States, 3 in Canada, and 1 in Greece. Since liberation I have paid three visits to the United States, but I spent a long time only on the present occasion, during which I made contacts with American scholars and Chinese-American professors as well as with students and teachers sent abroad by our government; consequently, I learned many more things than on the previous visits. On this occasion, it may be said that I had the problem of China's education in my mind while observing things abroad over the course of 5 months.

In light of what I observed abroad, I try to put forward some problems concerning the actual conditions of our higher education for a discussion with my colleagues. As the social system of the United States is different from ours, certain aspects of American universities, as mentioned below, can only be taken as references in the reform and development of our higher education, and cannot be copied completely as they are. Some may even serve as a lesson from which we may learn.

Here, it is necessary to point out that the universities we visited are famous ones in the United States, not common universities. Their standards are widely different; the difference between the famous and the common universities is very great.

In my opinion, the deciding factor, or one of the basic signs, of the success and standards of a university is its lineup of teachers. Teachers are the mainstay of a school. There has been absolutely no exception to this at any time or in any country.



Recently, the University of California (Berkeley) has had a tendency of being a latecomer surpassing the oldtimers. The important reason and its sign is that it has "enlisted" a number of scholars in all fields of liberal arts and sciences who are not at all conservative, have advanced scientific minds, and are full of vitality. Among them, there are 73 members of the American Academy of Sciences, including 10 Nobel Prize winners. They are all world famous as the foremost figures in learning.

As another example, the famous Massachusetts Institute of Technology has 1,000 assistant professors and those of higher status, including 150 members of the National Academy of Engineering or the Academy of Sciences.

Teachers in American universities have three ranks, namely professors, associate professors, and assistant professors. University teachers are selected from those postgraduate students who have completed their studies and have received a degree. It is impossible for a university graduate to teach immediately in a university. (A postgraduate student works concurrently as an assistant instructor). When postgraduate students have completed their studies and received a degree, most of them seek employment in corporations, enterprises, and government departments. Others are recruited by their professors to do scientific research work under their guidance. This is called the "postdoctoral" work. Such a person receives his wages from his professor's research funds. "Postdoctoral" work generally covers about 3 years. During this period, the schools and society will select personnel from among them in accordance with their performance at work. I myself also worked at such a post while at the same time looking for a job which I thought would be best for me. If there is a vacancy for an assistant professor in a certain department, the only way for this department to recruit a teacher is by open application. At that time, "postdoctors" at any school anywhere in the country and those of similar qualifications may apply for the job. Some professors will form a committee to examine the applications collectively and make a decision by voting. Through this means, whoever joins the ranks of university teachers cannot get his "iron rice-bowl." The university will still continue to make observations and selections from among the rank of assistant professors. The observation covers three fields: first, one's performance in teaching; second, one's achievements in research; third, one's contributions to the "small society" of the school. (This is somewhat similar to what we call social work.) To earn his promotion to associate professor, an assistant professor must have worked at least over 3 years, passed the test in these three fields, and gained the approval of the department's committee which examined and studied his case. There is a saying in American universities: "Either publish or perish." If he has no papers for continuous publication, he will be dismissed. Only when he becomes an associate professor is there a possibility for him to get a lifelong job in the university. (In some schools, only a professorship carries lifelong tenure.) The promotion of an associate professor to professor also requires the same tests and assessments, which generally will take 7 or 8 years.

In the United States, when a postgraduate student has completed his studies, he will have two prospects, whether he is in the "postdoctoral" stage, in the stage of being an assistant professor, or even in the stage of being an associate professor. He can get his promotion when he has made achievements in teaching and scientific research. If he has had no achievements, and especially if he has not

produced any good-quality papers in scientific research, he will leave the school to seek another job. (Or he has already gotten a better job for himself.) These two prospects constitute a "mutual choice" either for the society and the school or for himself. The society chooses talent, and an individual chooses the best job for himself. There is a very wide "space" for the schools and the society to choose talent. Here, what I mean by "space" includes geography and departments. American universities take in famous teachers, with no distinction being made for nationality. It is possible for half of the professors in a department not to be Americans. Examples can be found everywhere in which the academic head of an institute or a department is not an American. Individual teachers are often on the move among universities inside the country or even among universities abroad.

Of course, the movements of teachers among American schools are determined and restricted by the capitalist system and way of life. Such movements also have their side effects. Teachers do not always proceed from the standpoint of the development of science and education, but are on the move because of personal interests and for personal fame and gain. Under the socialist system we should, under the party's leadership, carry out the necessary readjustments to promote science and technology and develop education and to "make the best possible use of men and talent," and by our policy we should particularly encourage teachers to go to remote frontiers and do their work.

In a word, a good university must have its methods and traditions of making strict choices of qualified teachers, and it must have conditions for selecting talented persons. Otherwise, talented persons will be stifled in a pond of stagnant water. Also, some unqualified persons will hold posts which they should not hold. Only by continuously eliminating its personnel through strict selection can a university break free from conservatism, become full of vitality, and continuously advance in learning.

Strict selection and elimination complement each other. Without elimination we cannot talk about selection. Naturally, there must be the criterion of selection. Ours is a socialist country, and we have our criteria for judging talent. We must adhere to "Red and expert." If we only see one's talent without considering the political criteria, it will be a great mistake. On the other hand, we have made many "left" mistakes in the matter of intellectuals. In the selection of talented persons and in the choice of teachers, there was once the wrong tendency of taking "Red" for expert and using politics to attack vocational work, of treating knowledge as something "white," and of regarding intellectuals as a dissident force. Under the guidance of such wrong ideas, the schools chose their teachers with a tendency to disregard their learning, and to do this work as a simple personnel matter. Over many years, though the majority of teachers are competent, we should also admit that for various reasons we have actually retained some persons who are not qualified, have sent some very promising talented persons to posts where they cannot be used in the best possible way, and have even pushed out those with many gifts.

When I was in the United States, a well-known professor said to me: "Chinese people are industrious and intelligent, and you also have a billion in population. In the future, science and culture are yours." When I heard these words, I thought

about ourselves, a big country of a billion people that should have talented persons coming forth in large numbers. However, this is not quite true in reality. As an educational worker training talented persons, I am deeply disturbed. Our universities should sum up lessons drawn from "left" mistakes; how can we correct these mistakes? In the selection of teachers and cadres, we should forget about personal prejudices and factional interests and should think about the needs of our country and society. We should appoint people on their merits and should break through such a small "geographical space" as the college compound. On the question of talented persons, we should change the situation whereby we are keeping them in a pond of stagnant water. We should smash the "iron ricebowls." And so on and so forth. In a word, to manage a university successfully, we must break with some old conventions on the fundamental question of selecting personnel.

The second question about which I feel deeply is how to train talented persons.

Let us talk first about the famous universities in the United States. (They are equal to our key universities.) They have a set of examination systems and selection methods for their students. When students enter a university, the freshman class is not divided according to departments. In some universities even the sophomore class is not divided. The dean of Harvard University told me: "When students enter Harvard, they are students at Harvard University, not students of any department." After 2 years of study in the university, the students can make their own choice, according to their understanding of the university and the results of their study, to study liberal arts or science. If, after a student joins a certain department, he finds that it does not meet his aspirations and interests, he may ask to be transferred to another department. This is one aspect of the system.

Secondly, when students enter a university, they have a very wide selection of courses of study. Each school has its own regulations, but the fundamental spirit is the same. Take Harvard University as an example. Each student is required to study 32 courses. If he majors in history, he must study 16 courses in history, 8 obligatory courses which all students of liberal arts or science at the university must take, and another 8 courses of his own free choice. As a rule, he can complete his study of these 32 courses in 4 years.

Thirdly, students of any courses in the university are invariably required to study the humanities and the social sciences. The president of California Institute of Technology, my other alma mater, said: "We require our students to spend 20 percent of their time in the study of the social sciences and the humanities. This is the tradition of California Institute of Technology, because we not only are training an engineer or a scientist, but most fundamentally we are training people." "Students should learn culture and art, history and the social sciences. They must know society and people, because every scientist is dealing with people and society every day and every hour." I read the list of courses for students at the Chemistry Institute of the University of California, Berkeley, which offers 62 subjects of literature, the humanities and the social sciences as elective courses for the institute's students, including subjects from "Comparative Literature," "Theatrical Art," "The Golden Age of Greece," "The Art of China and Japan," "An Introduction to European Painting," and "An Introduction to Music" to "Ancient



"Philosophy" and "Modern Kant Philosophy," as well as "An Introduction to Archaeology," "World Population and Economy," "American Economic History," "Culture and Historical Geography," "European Civilization," "The State of California," "National Security Political Science," and others.

The mission of a university is to train talent. Here, two points must be taken into consideration. First is the needs of society. Second, training must be conducted according to the characteristics of those who receive education--"to make the best possible use of men" and "to teach students in accordance with their aptitude." A good university must achieve both.

After liberation, the nationwide unified enrollment of new students in China's institutes of higher education was the work of training talented persons on the grandest scale in the world; the task was most arduous; and the results were most remarkable. In the 10 years from 1950 to 1959, I was personally responsible for enrollment work in Beijing Municipality, north China, and northeast areas as well as throughout the country, and I had a lot of experience. However, our method of training people still has its shortcomings. Before the students enter a school, they first apply for the entrance examination of a separate department; after they have entered school, it is very difficult for them to shift to another department. For many long years in the past, after the students entered school they were taught in one whole class of nearly 100 according to one timetable, and all were trained alike. It was not possible to develop the students' initiative or to allow the students to take their own road of growth according to the needs of society, the development of their special lines, and their individual skill and interest. These things have yet to be improved. In the light of the current conditions of the institutes of higher education, it is impossible to carry out total reform in this field immediately. Under the prerequisite of maintaining stability and unity, many universities have paid attention to the shortcoming of a lack of flexibility and have made many changes in the method of offering elective courses. This is very encouraging. However, the matter of sticking to one department after the students enter school has even "developed," because the number of new students has increased very quickly in recent years. At present, when middle-school graduates apply for the entrance examination of universities, the choices of speciality to study and department to apply for are, in most cases, decided by the "tipoffs" of their parents. Every [year] before summer vacation time, "tipoffs" are in fashion for a time and are transmitted from one person to another. Admission to a given school or department will be based on so many marks, which speciality is a "dark horse," what is the best way of listing the order of preferences in preparing the application form, and so forth and so on. When a person chooses the subject of his study and his future profession in this way, it is a very frightful phenomenon.

Some people argue in favor of choosing one's lifework upon applying for the entrance examination on the grounds that ours is a socialist society which requires planning. However, what is the basis of planning? Under capitalism, the needs of society are satisfied by spontaneous market adjustment. For instance, computers now are the key to the modernization of production and administration, and so more students wish to study computers. For such adjustment, the reaction is sensitive, but there must be blind competition. This is the drawback of capitalist society. In many years, we met social needs by planning. In our socialist system, planning



is very necessary. However, our experience shows that in the past there were many problems in planning. In material production, we suffered quite enough from subjective "planning." In spiritual production, subjective "planning" stifled so many really talented persons that there is no way to count their numbers. We should sum up our experience in planning, reform our ways of training people, try to find our own path, and integrate socialist planning with "the best possible use of men."

In the work of education, we have gained a great many good experiences of our own. Since liberation, our higher education has provided the state with large numbers of qualified personnel, and the results have been very great. However, we should not feel complacent because of this. We must sum up our own experiences, select the essence of foreign education, discard its dross, and continuously carry out our reforms. The reason for this is that our work is still far from being able to meet the needs of the four modernizations.

The third question of American university education in which I am interested is the modernization of learning.

Take the Institute of Liberal Arts and Sciences at the University of California (Berkeley) as an example. It has 42 departments. Furthermore, it also has many transdepartmental special groups, such as "biostatistics," "neurobiology," "logic and scientific methodology," "population statistics," "problems of Buddhism," "social welfare," "political economy of industrial society," "problems of women" and "large-scale communications exchange problems"--26 in all. With regard to courses offered in the departments, they have many newly emerging sciences and frontier sciences. In this respect, we are still very wanting.

For another example, California Institute of Technology, which has only 1,700 students, has six institutes and 20 departments. Besides the five institutes of biology; physics, mathematics, and astronomy; geology and planets; chemistry and chemical engineering; and engineering and applied sciences, there is another institute of humanities and the social sciences. We may cite the curricula for the sophomore and junior classes of this institute to explain how they train students in frontier sciences. The key courses for sophomore students are sophomore mathematics (partial differential equation, probability, and mathematical analysis), electrokinetics and quantum dynamics, an introduction to microeconomy, an introduction to macroeconomy, and some elective courses. Junior class students are required to study intermediary microeconomy, metrological economy, currency, income and increase, statistics, computer modeling and data processing as well as some elective courses. (The common courses of the freshman class include, among others, mathematics, physics, chemistry or biology for a semester.) These social science students will have a good foundation in scientific or engineering technology. After graduation, they can hold jobs in the humanities, the social sciences, or commercial and government administrative departments.

Academically, our higher education still remains out-of-date and backward. Fundamentally this is the result of the disastrous effect brought about by "left" mistakes over many years. For instance, we casually placed the bourgeois label on sociology and psychology, eliminated them as "white flags," and suspended these two departments of science for as long as 30 years. At present, people have admitted the "left" influence in the economic fields. On the education front, it is

fairly easy to admit problems in the 10-year catastrophe, but it is more difficult to realize that at present there are still certain "left" effects.

The fourth question is that of the ideological education of young people.

I was out of the country for 5 months, and though I was very much concerned about what was in the minds of foreign university students, unfortunately I had very little contact with young students, and what I saw was very superficial. In capitalist countries, the present lifestyle has changed greatly, compared with that of 50 years ago when I was a student in the United States. As a result, the moral standards and the concept of values have also changed. In a society of very keen struggle for existence and also of very bountiful material products, most young people think about making money and seek pleasure. My impression of American university students is that the majority of them do not work hard, and those who do their best in their studies are in the minority. American universities have plenty of successful experience in vocational training; however, in ideological and moral education, even from the view of safeguarding their own social system, many of their own educationists and scientists are not satisfied.

I have a sense of consolation and pride toward Chinese university students in comparison with American university students. The majority of our students wish to take the road of socialism, show courage in their thinking, and study hard. Either in their attitude toward study or in their moral thinking, they are far better than the young people of capitalist countries.

Nevertheless, as a veteran teacher I also have "worries" at the bottom of my heart for this generation of university students. The present-day university students differ from those before liberation, as well as from those before the "Great Cultural Revolution." In 1980 the new students admitted into Beijing University were on average between 17 and 25 years of age. From the time when they began to understand things, at 6 or 7, an unprecedented catastrophe of 10 years broke out around them. They grew up during a period of turmoil and entered the university at the turning point of history. What the young students are thinking about, we of the older generation often do not realize or understand. The present-day university students are to a certain extent confused in their thinking, and it is difficult for each of them to decide what he or she is after. This is nothing strange. Lengthy turmoil and an abrupt turn in the course of events will naturally have such an impact on young people, who are like a sheet of blank paper. The problem is that if our educational workers see this but still attempt nothing and accomplish nothing, it will be a serious dereliction of duty on their part.

We must intensify and improve the work of ideological and political education in the schools. In dealing with the ideological problems of young people, we must adhere to the principle of "persuasion," give guidance according to the four basic principles, inculcate in students communist ideology, communist morality, and the party's fine tradition, lead the students to seek truth and cast away falsehood, and help them to cultivate a Marxist world outlook. We should not use pressure, and still less should we come down with a big stick upon the students, put a label on them, and seize on their mistakes. Students having wrong ideas constitute a very small minority, but we must pay great attention to them. As long as they do not commit crimes, we must take our stand on education, adhere to the four basic

principles, and do our best to win them over. In ideological and political work we have gained a great deal of useful experience, and we should make full use of our experience. There are also many mistakes and lessons learned, however; we must earnestly sum them up or discard them.

China's young students are so nice. They study hard before they enter the university, receive their education under our guidance, and then leave our university for society. They are the people who hold the future of our motherland in their hands. As their teachers we have very great responsibilities. Therefore, we ourselves must also study hard, raise our consciousness, continuously remold our world outlook, set ourselves as examples, and be worthy of the name of teacher.

The fifth question concerns the leadership of institutes of higher education.

In discussing the history of famous American universities, we must always mention their founders, who were all people of prestige in academic circles. My alma mater, the California Institute of Technology, was originally a local technological institute. It grew to be a first-rate university of the world and became the birthplace of the first American manmade satellite through the industrious cultivation of some famous scholars and educationists. They were: Hale, the first director of the then largest Wilson Observatory in the United States; Noes, acting president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Millikan, founder and president of the institute; Morgan, Nobel Prize winner in biology; and Du Bridge, head of the radiation laboratory of Massachusetts Institute of Technology during the Second World War. The radiation laboratory was actually a radar research laboratory where 4,000 scientific workers from all parts of the country gathered at that time for this work. Later, he also became president of California Institute of Technology and did outstanding work. Another president of the institute, Brown, is also a physicist and was once the head of the Berkeley Lawrence Laboratory. Later he was appointed secretary of defense by the Carter administration. American universities pay great attention to their leadership, and look for their presidents throughout the country. Recently the Massachusetts Institute of Technology spent more than a year to choose the right new president.

This situation is common with many famous universities in the world. In the history of our Beijing University, Mr Cai Yuanpei [5591 0337 1014] was a very accomplished president who also had made great achievements in learning. He understood very well that to make a success of his administration of the university, he needed not only to promote freedom of learning but also to appoint many teachers with new ideas and profound knowledge. In Beijing University he organized discussion meetings and conferences of professors to bring into play the leading role of the teachers. He carried out major readjustments of the departments and courses in the university. In memory of Mr Cai Yuanpei, in March of last year I published an article in the papers to commemorate the 40th anniversary of his death.

From the history of growth of famous universities at home and abroad, we may see that a school is a place for learning, with innovation and renovation as the feature of its academic activities, pursuit of truth as its indomitable spirit, and respect for reality as its scientific attitude. Every immortal scholar had his own personal characteristics. A good school also has its own style. Only



the principal, professors, and teachers of the school can put everything in motion. The leading role of teachers lies herein. For many years our shortcoming in work was poor school administration, as the responsibility of promoting the growth of the schools was seldom given to the teachers. This form of leadership has restricted in different degrees the vigorous growth of the schools.

In the realm of economy, we have deeply felt the great loss and damage done to our country by those who did not understand science and who held supreme power in their hands. One of the abuses brought about by "left" mistakes in economic construction was the emphasis on "nonprofessionals leading the professionals," which whetted bureaucracy and blind command. Economic losses and damage are "tangible," but losses and damage in educational work are "intangible." Therefore, on the education front, it is even more difficult to rectify "left" mistakes.

For the successful administration of socialist universities, we must uphold the leadership of the party. We must resolutely oppose any tendency which tries to weaken, cast away, or eliminate the party's leadership over schools. We must uphold and intensify the party's leadership and improve the party's leadership. At present in the institutes of higher education, it is still necessary to further carry on the system of holding the president of a school responsible under the leadership of the school's party committee. The party committee should have a good grasp of the party's line, principles, and policies and should perform well the work of supervising the cadres, party affairs, and ideological-political work, so that there will be a division of work between the party and the government. The responsibility for the daily routine of administration and vocational affairs should be given to administrative and vocational departments. Further, a very few qualified schools may be taken as selected points for conducting tests to make their presidents responsible for administration and the party committees to play a supervisory, safeguarding role. As I said earlier that the growth of school learning and education should be promoted by the teachers, this is the very substance of my proposal to intensify and improve the leadership of our party. We should strengthen the ranks of political cadres and administrative cadres in schools; they should be good at achieving unity and exercising leadership, and they should boldly trust the large number of teachers who have been educated by the party through many years, who have special qualifications in learning, who have practical experience in teaching and scientific research, and who are devoted to the cause of education.

Since liberation, our institutes of higher education have, under the leadership of the party, trained large numbers of outstanding cadres and technical and educational personnel. Today, they have become the backbone of various fronts. These achievements are very great. Without socialist new China's educational undertaking of more than 30 years, it would be impossible to have a foundation for launching the campaign of four modernizations today. However, we should not overlook the fact that in our schools the danger from the "left" is one of long standing. Not only during the unprecedented 10-year catastrophe did education suffer most deeply, were intellectuals trodden below the "eighth category," and were science and culture thrown into the nether world, but also long before the "Great Cultural Revolution" there were many occasions of mishap. For instance, the enlarged anti-rightist campaign in 1957 victimized many intellectuals, the Great Leap Forward in 1958 turned schools into grounds for "herry-making," the antirightist campaign



in 1959 pointed its spearhead at the "experts within the party" in schools and discredited large numbers of Red and expert cadres, and the "socialist education" movement in 1964 criticized "left" deviations by taking them as right deviations. Then came the 10-year catastrophe. Although the great majority among us tasted to the full the bitterness of these campaigns, there were at the same time those who supported "left" mistakes in this or that period, and there were those who committed those mistakes. The time was so long, and the impact was so wide and far-reaching, on such questions as nonprofessionals and professionals, the policy toward the intellectuals, politics and vocational affairs, choosing a person for a job, training personnel, learning and politics, and so forth and so on, that it is by no means easy to rectify the deviations and errors. We should not cut history apart as if everything is correct today, but sometime later it will be necessary to reassess everything. In my opinion, it takes more than one cold day for a river to freeze 3 feet deep, and furthermore the ice cannot thaw completely overnight. We have no need to find out those responsible for past errors. However, as leading persons of schools, we must clearly recognize these errors, honestly admit them, and earnestly draw a lesson from them. To meet the needs of the four modernizations, we must reform higher education. To accomplish this, we may start from selecting personnel (teachers), training talent (students), activating learning, strengthening ideological-political education, and improving and strengthening the party's leadership; sum up past experiences; earnestly make a clear distinction between the correct line and the wrong line; unite with the majority; and resolutely but carefully carry out reform. By doing this, our educational enterprise probably will forge rapidly ahead and make its contributions to the four modernizations. I believe that, under the correct leadership of the Party Central Committee, our educational enterprise will certainly grow and flourish.

9039

CSO: 4005/539

## SOCIOLOGICAL, EDUCATION AND CULTURE

### 'HEBEI RIBAO' STRESSES NEED FOR POPULATION CONTROL

Shijiazhuang HEBEI RIBAO in Chinese 6 Mar 81 p 1

[Article by a HEBEI RIBAO commentator: "To Control the Growth of Population Is A Strategic Mission"]

[Text] In the regulation of the national economy, the accomplishment of planned control of the increase in population is an arduous strategic task. Each and every party committee and government must seriously pay special attention to this important matter.

Since the founding of the People's Republic, for a relatively long period of time we have not paid attention to the task of family planning. The population is growing too much and too fast and it has already become a serious hindrance to advancement, seriously affecting the development of the national economy and improvement in the people's lives. During the years just following liberation, the population of this province was 30.86 million. In the 30 years from 1949 to 1980, there was a total of 31.8 million births; subtracting deaths, there was a natural increase of 19.5 million. In a short 31 years, a population increase of such magnitude has brought great pressure on all aspects of the national economy. Based on the 1979 estimate of over 690 jin of grain per person in this province, the increased population would use 136 million jin of grain per year. Just following liberation, the average area of cultivable land in this province was 3.5 mu per person. At present, it is less than 2 mu per person. From 1978 to 1980, approximately 200,000 mu of land was used yearly for capital construction and construction of housing in villages. If things continue to develop like this, with the population increasing year by year while cultivable land decreases year by year, then in less than 50 or even 10 or so years, there will only be a few units of land per person. With cultivable land decreasing and the demand for grain increasing, if we don't do something to solve this problem we will leave this contradiction for future generations and it will become a difficult problem. During the past 30 years, there has been an average rate of increase of 1 million births per year; these people not only need to be fed, clothed, housed, employed, and cared for medically, but they will also need to go to school, obtain employment, get married and give birth in succession. We already have an intimate knowledge of the heavy burden and pressure this will put on the departments of education, labor, commerce and the national economy. Of course, this is not only shown in the area of economics. The excessively rapid increase in population and the disproportionate development of the national economy still influences the stability and unit of society, the education of a generation of youths, the socialization of housework,

the ecological environment and a series of social, political and educational problems. It has already obstructed the development of socialist construction, and if it is not resolved soon, the course of the four modernizations will undoubtedly be delayed. Therefore, the population must be controlled. In order to keep the total population at the end of this century from exceeding 1.2 billion, the party Central Committee and the State Council issued a call to the entire party and all the people encouraging couples to have just one child. We are determined to attend to the problem in accordance with the call of the party central committee, and to strive hard to realize this strategic task. We ask that the entire membership body of the party, members of the Communist Youth League, and especially cadres at all levels, all set an example. Young comrades should join with me and older cadres should educate and urge their children to join the faction promoting family planning.

For the past year or so, the practice of promoting one child per couple has proved that one child per couple is not only necessary, but can also be accomplished. Many party and league members, vast numbers of cadres and the masses have responded positively to the call of the party Central Committee and the State Council, consciously supported late marriages and late births, taken the lead in having only one child, and as the party Central Committee's "Open Letter" said: "The facts have proved that the Chinese people are reasonable, that they take the situation as a whole into consideration, are able to show understanding for the country's difficulties and are also able to think about the interests of generations to come."

Because more than 85 percent of the people in this province live in rural areas, emphasis should be placed on paying special attention in these areas to the work of family planning, preparing public opinion, and the propagation of the special significance and scientific knowledge concerning family planning, raising the awareness of family planning among the cadres and masses. For a long period in the past, due to the influence of "leftist" thought, people were not fully aware, or were not at all aware, of the problems which might appear as a result of overpopulation. In the people's minds there still are some deep-rooted remnants of feudal thought such as, "the more children, the more prosperous", "continue the family line by producing an heir", and "value males over females", etc. Overcoming both the feudalistic consciousness which exists in their minds and the influence of the small peasants will not be easy. Moreover, the level of education in science is low, and especially in the rural areas, knowledge of human physiology and contraception has either not been disseminated enough, or in some cases, no one dared to do so. In order to turn around the people's ideology we must strive to strengthen the dissemination of education and the work of persuading the people. With a definite object in view, we must direct the carrying out of propaganda and explanation against the unclear knowledge and mistaken viewpoints of the masses. We must explain clearly to the masses the state of the country, the problems created by overpopulation and the need for development of the national economy in controlling the population increase. We must widely promote methods of accounting and raise the understanding of the people. We must propagate increased production of material goods and less child births as a contribution to the four modernizations, vigorously commend advanced models, and establish a new custom in society of the glory of having just one child per couple. When the thought of the entire membership of the party, league members, cadres at all levels and the broad masses is united in the party Central Committee's "Open Letter", then our task will be easier to carry out.

In bringing about family planning, fulfilling the population plan must be earnestly carried down to the people; contraception must be supported as the main policy, and in accordance with the combined principle of national guidance and the voluntary participation of the masses, birth control measures must be earnestly carried out; we must support understanding early, carefully and honestly; we must widely disseminate and vigorously popularize the quality of surgical operations; and strengthen the planning, supply and supervision of contraceptive devices, and open channels making them beneficial for use by the people.

All levels of the party committee and government must go a step further in strengthening leadership in the work of family planning. First, in the leading groups, we must go a step further in increasing knowledge of the strategic significance of family planning and stressing self-awareness of the work of family planning. Party central committees above the county level must stress the above at least four times a year, and party organizations below the county level must continuously stress family planning. We must support the stressing of the two types of production together, and in stressing industrial and agricultural production, while at the same time stressing technological work, carry out family planning, increase production and decrease the speed of the population increase. The party committees and government at all levels should pay special attention to the study of the new situation and new problems which will appear in family planning following the implementation of the system of responsibility in production in the rural areas, and seriously implement the related policies of family planning. We must seriously stress typical cases and accomplish the transformation of backward units. Under the unified leadership of the party Central Committee, free play will be given to the actions of each governmental department and people's organization, combining each of the concrete demands proposed in the Central Committee's "Open Letter" with the special work characteristics of each department, and bringing them into line with the work plans, stressing and fulfilling them.

In the area of family planning we once created many good experiences. Under new conditions, we must continue to constantly sum up new experiences, promoting the constant development of work. If we only strengthen party leadership, accomplish the work of propagating education, and also old appropriate policy measures, then we will certainly be able to bring the work of family planning in this province to a new level, making a new contribution to the four modernizations.

9686

CSO: 4005/526



## SOCIOLOGICAL, EDUCATION AND CULTURE

### TRADITIONAL ETHICAL CONCEPTS IN LIGHT OF POPULATION PROBLEM

Beijing RENMIN RIBAO (in Chinese 26 Mar 81 p 5

[Article by Fei Xiaotong (6316 1321 6636): "China's Traditional Ethical Concepts and the Population Problem"]

[Text] In Chinese society there are several traditional ethical concepts which are related to the population problem. I'll give just one example here: the belief that having many sons is a good thing; it is one of the happy things in life and the responsibility of each person. If you do not act in this way you will be scoffed at and possibly even punished.

A society's ethical concepts are not just the empty talk of a couple of scholars, but are the force in society which controls the conduct of the people. We cannot consider the words, "there are three major offenses against filial piety, and not producing a heir is the greatest of them," as that of one school, Confucianist thought. This was the standard of behavior for practitioners in traditional Chinese society. The Confucianists of past ages, however, were the upholders of the standards for this type of social conduct and not the creators of it. These standards were not thought up by the Confucianists. What they did was think up a lot of reasons for propagating them. They made a great effort to support and propagate these standards of conduct and to put them into effect.

At this point we should ask a few questions: how did these types of ethical concepts come about and what kind of influence have they actually had on the population?

I believe that this type of ethical concept was a product of the small-scale peasant economy. In such an economy the family is the production unit and the agricultural economy is carried out chiefly through physical labor. The concept of more births and more males has a concrete economic value in such an economy, and the degree of strength or weakness in manpower, family income and the quality of life are all intimately connected.

In a patriarchal society, after a daughter grows up and gets married she becomes part of the work force of another family. On the other hand, after a son grows up he can marry and bring his wife into his family, increasing the work force of his own family. The favoring of males over females has an economic basis. Today in our villages when a daughter marries the custom of demanding a high cash gift is still popular. This is also a reflection of the process of the transfer of the labor force.

The ethical concept born of this economic basis and related to the population was not one of just more births, but of more male births. This is easy to understand.

If we go a step further in understanding the basic power structure of society in past ages we can see that in a society in which the clan organization is the foundation, everything must be done to expand the scope of blood relations and to encourage the demand for more male births. Therefore, this type of ethical concept was not only linked to the economic basis of that period, but also to the political circumstances of the period.

These considerations have led us to the study of the ways in which ethical concepts serve economics and politics in society, and in turn, to understand the reasons for their existence and continuation.

If we were to ask if this concept of more male births had a positive or a negative effect on social development in China, the answer would not be simple. Whatever effect it has is determined by the concrete circumstances of society. When there were still vast areas of usable land available, and in the past, when physical labor was the major means of agricultural technology, this type of ethical concept which encouraged an increase in population was beneficial to economic development. However, when the circumstances change, the nature of the effect changes right along with it.

At present we are carrying out the four modernizations, and agricultural modernization will once and for all transform the small-scale peasant economy. As a result, the traditional ethical concepts produced by this small-scale peasant economy have not only lost their positive effect in advancing economic development, but in addition, are increasingly becoming a negative factor which is interfering with modernization.

In the 30 years since liberation, population-related ethical concepts have not changed all that much, at least not in a large number of villages. Due to the fast development of health and medical services, and in addition, the long period of peace, the death rate has dropped. Of course, the birth rate had a corresponding increase. The population in 1928 was 474 million. By 1949 it had grown to 548 million. During this period there was an approximate increase of 74 million. Following this, the population increase accelerated: in 1953 it was about 600 million, in 1957 about 656 million and in 1960 it had reached 707 million. At present, the population has already grown to over 900 million. This means that in 30 years there was a net increase of 420 million, or in other words, our population has doubled during the past 40 years. Meanwhile, the fact that our land has been able to feed a population which has doubled shows clearly the development of our socialist economy during the 30 years since liberation. However, this increase in population in just a short half-century, objectively speaking, has also increased the number of difficulties in accumulating funds for building modernization.

The facts before us are as follows: Since our government began to vigorously implement family planning, while city residents have already achieved outstanding results, resistance in the rural areas has been strong. There is no doubt that this type of resistance is partially because the peasants are more backward culturally than city dwellers, find it difficult and are slower in accepting new ideas. However, the main reason, I believe, is in the foundation of the small-scale peasant economy. Only in a new economic foundation will we be able to bring forward new ethical concepts.

The carrying out of sociological investigation and analysis of ethical concepts not only has theoretical significance but also practical significance. Since we are determined to carry out the four modernizations, therefore the various ideologies, including all types of ethical concepts, produced by the small-scale peasant economy, which support this type of backward state, are bound to be shattered by the development of history. In order to lessen the price of this unavoidable process, the scientific investigation and study of ideology should be put on the agenda. (Selected from "Democracy and Legal Systems," 1981, No 1).

9686

CSO: 4005/526

## SOCIOLOGICAL, EDUCATION AND CULTURE

### RESEARCH GROUPS STUDY IDEAL POPULATION FOR FUTURE

Jinan DAZHONG RIBAO in Chinese 5 Mar 81 p 4

[Article: "After Modernization What Would Be the Ideal Population"]

[Text] What would be the most appropriate number of people in China following modernization? The theoretical population research groups of Beijing and Xian have both reached almost identical conclusions in their respective studies: in 100 years, the ideal population would be approximately 700 million.

These groups carried out their research with the help of both social scientists and natural scientists. The Beijing research institute carried out its research in the areas of economic development, natural resources of food, and ecological balance in the environment. This group considered that under the conditions of fixed natural resources, the ideal population mainly depends upon the rate of economic development and the level which can be attained. They consulted both Chinese and foreign data, and on the basis of a reasonable determination of future industrial and agricultural fixed assets and the rate of increase in technical equipment for workers, calculated that 100 years from now there would be 180 million workers, and that the ideal total population for the country would be 650 million people. They also made general estimates of the future increase in the rate of output for all types of foodstuffs and the increase in consumption of modern society, deeming that within 100 years the total output of food could increase 1.5 times. A population of not more than 680 million would be considered appropriate at that time. Meanwhile, in order to maintain an ecological balance, especially along with the development of industrial and agricultural production and the increase in the use of water for living needs, and calculating the resources of fresh water, after 100 years, the appropriate population would be 640 million. This group used cybernetic optimization methods of analysis to arrive at dozens of planned estimates for ways to achieve an ideal population. They suggested several plans for population control under the premise that in the future the crest of the population would not exceed 1.2 billion people, aging of the population would not become a serious problem, and the burden of manpower would not become too great.

Hu Baosheng [5178 0202 3982] and others from the population research laboratory at the Jiaotong University Systems Engineering Research Institute in Xian began with the economy, the state of the present population, national power, the psychology of the people and other conditions in studying the 20 or so related factors which will influence the population targets are for 100 years from now. They adopted systems engineering multi purpose decision-making techniques and comprehensively dealt with the dynamic quantitative relationship of these related factors. They considered that a good target population for 100 years from now would be 700 million. In the future, should economic and scientific development exceed expectations, or if demands concerning the standard of living decrease a bit, then the figures could be relaxed from 700 million to 750 million.

9686

CSO: 4005/526



## SOCIOLOGICAL, EDUCATION AND CULTURE

### AGRICULTURAL BACKWARDNESS SEEN AS FUNDAMENTAL CAUSE OF RAPID POPULATION GROWTH

Beijing RENKOY YANJIU [POPULATION RESEARCH] in Chinese No 1, Jan 81 pp 17-22

[Article by Lin Gang [2651 1511] of the Theoretical Office, JIGFANGJUN BAO

[Excerpt] In 1949, the new China was established and the construction of socialism was begun. A historically formed national economy with an agriculture industry whose technological level was extremely low as its major component was the basis for our entire construction effort at that time. In the past 30 years, this basis has not really undergone any fundamental revision. Agriculture still depends mainly on hand labor, the same old historic path is still being trod. For this reason, the population laws produced by the extremely low agricultural production in feudal societies still play a budgetary role in the growing agricultural villages which constitute 80 percent of our total population. Furthermore, following the elimination of feudal oppression and exploitation, the control of the various factors of this law's effects resulted in its demise. The living and health standards of the people were raised universally. It can be said that this law played an even more complete and swift role in our population process after liberation. After agrarian reform, the poor farmers who had no land or little land were allocated 700 million mu in land thus avoiding rent burdens of several billion jin of grain yearly. Agricultural production forces were greatly liberated and agricultural production was swiftly restored and began developing. With all of this, our nation showed its peak period for births during the years 1952 to 1957. During this period the total population increased 12 to 13 million per year and the rate of natural increase was over 2 percent.<sup>1</sup> Of course the great population increase of this period carried a definite compensatory quality.

After this, our industry, particularly the heavy industries experienced a swift development. In 1949, heavy industries only constituted 8 percent of the total output value for the national economy. After the "first 5 year plan," it increased to 26.6 percent.<sup>2</sup> This rapid increase, as far as the capability of our agricultural burden is concerned, was at that time suspiciously fast. At this time, great effort should, of course, have been made to revise agricultural technology, greatly improve agricultural labor productivity and use the agricultural development and accompanying population increase in the cities to satisfy the requirements of an increase in agricultural products. But, unfortunately, this was not done. The use of even more labor was still relied upon to obtain an increase in total agricultural production and to satisfy the

daily increasing requirements for industrial developments in agricultural products. After the "second 5-year plan," along with the one-sided development of heavy industry and the emerging economic imbalance, this situation was intensified even more. The result was that the role of the population pattern produced by the extremely low level of agricultural production was intensified even more, becoming the second highest population increase since the founding of the nation. This period lasted for 10 successive years from 1962 to 1971. The number of births each year was greater than previous periods by 1 million and even 10 million.

In order to specifically explain the relationship between the one-sided development of heavy industry following the "second 5-year plan" and the second highest period of population increase since the founding of the nation, a graph of the distribution of the labor population in the two areas of agriculture and heavy industry has been constructed (see Figure 3). The curves  $W_1(p)$  and  $W_2(p)$  in the graph describe production for agricultural and heavy industry, respectively, following changes in labor population (in reality, it may be that the status of  $W_2(p)$  is otherwise, however this does not have an effect on the essence of the problem we are describing). Lines  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  describe the total demand raised for agricultural products and heavy industrial products, respectively, following population changes (assuming that average demand is known and unchanging). Point  $p$  on the horizontal axis is the total labor population for the two areas. The vertical line leading from point  $p$  intersecting line  $A_1$  at  $R_1$  gives the total demand for agricultural products. The line leading from  $A_1$  toward the vertical axis intersects the curve  $W_1(p)$  and a line from the point of that intersection leads to intersect with  $p$ . We have determined this to produce  $R_1$ , the required agricultural labor population,  $Op_1$ . The remaining population,  $p - p_1$  [as published], is heavy industrial labor population. The point of intersection,  $R_2$ , of the curve  $W_2(p)$ , line  $A_2$ , and a line from point  $p$  is the total demand for heavy industrial products. The upward spiral of  $W_2$ , the increase of total production of heavy industrial goods, can be used to describe the one-sided development of heavy industry. If  $A_2$  now spirals down a position on the dotted line the graph then indicates heavy industrial production increases to  $R_0$  on the vertical line from point  $p$ . If a perpendicular line is drawn from  $R_0$  to curve  $W_2(p)$  and further from that point of intersection a perpendicular line is drawn to the horizontal axis intersecting at  $p_0$ , then  $pp_0$  describes the necessary increase in heavy industrial labor required for an increase from  $R_2$  to  $R_0$  (as described by the dotted line in the graph). Obviously, this one increase in a short period of time, cannot possibly be supplemented by the natural increase in total population. The only method available is the forced transfer of personnel from the agricultural labor population. This being the case, the position of  $R_1$ , total agricultural production, inevitably drops and line  $A$  will certainly spiral downward. This signifies a decrease in the average amount of food possessed by the total population. This, in turn requires further increases of labor engaged in agricultural production in order to restore the original average standard of living. At this time, agricultural production not only requires that an amount equal to  $pp_0$  be transferred from heavy industry, but also requires an increase for a period of surplus agricultural products sufficient to support the newly increased labor from the heavy industrial population,  $pp_0$ . Under the pressure of one-sided development of heavy industry the doubled demand for labor force in agricultural production will inevitably stimulate a rapid increase in the entire population.

The process described in the aforementioned reliable graph expresses particularly clearly these several years after the beginning of our "second 5-year plan." Steel production doubled in the 1958 plan, investment in metallurgy nearly tripled forcing investment in all heavy industry to more than double. The output value of heavy industry rose sharply 78.8 percent. Thus, the labor population in heavy industry increased sharply. Correspondingly, the population of cities and towns and the nonagricultural population also increased a great deal:

**Increase of Heavy Industrial Labor and Nonagricultural Populations, 1957-1958<sup>3</sup>**  
(unit: 10,000)

<u>Year</u>	<u>Heavy Industrial Labor</u>	<u>Nonagricultural</u>	<u>Urban Population</u>
1957	557	10,618	9,949
1958	3,550	12,210	10,721
Increase	2,993	1,592	772

The heavy industrial labor population increase is surprising. This kind of increase comes primarily from a shift of agricultural population. During the period 1957 to 1958, the agricultural labor force decreased from 192 million to 151 million, a net decrease of 41 million. At the same time, the burden of arable land per laborer increased from 8.8 mu in 1957 to 11 mu. Add to this a decrease in farm animals during this time and the actual burden is even greater. Consequently a great decrease in agricultural production was created: in 1957 grain production was 390.1 billion jin, in 1960 it had dropped to 287 billion jin, a net decrease of more than 100 billion jin.<sup>4</sup> The average amount of food possessed by the people of the entire country thus dropped sharply and getting a full stomach became a serious problem. After 1960, 20 million industrial workers were transferred to the countryside. However, it was sufficient to compensate for several years of a reduced agricultural labor force (industrial transfers, increased mortality during 1959-1961 and absolute decreases). After 1959-1961, the standard of living had a recovery and as a result, the population birthrate rose sharply, to as high as 4 per cent in 1962. The natural rate of increase is 3.35 percent. This was the highest population increase since the founding of the nation.

After the "third 5-year plan," due to a bumper agricultural harvest in 1970, the number of industrial workers again showed a fairly large increase. Within this increase, heavy industry workers increased much faster than light industry

**Increase of Industrial Workers 1970-1972<sup>5</sup>** (unit: 10,000)

	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>
Increased workers	444	423	263
Light industry	131	85	110
Heavy industry	313	338	153

workers. At this time, the population of agricultural laborers increased continually. However, the ratio of agricultural to industrial laborers clearly dropped:



## Ratio of Industrial and Agricultural Labor Populations<sup>6</sup>

<u>1965</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>
1:12.8	1:9.9	1:9.8	1:8.1

The corresponding decrease in the agricultural labor population implies that the amount of agricultural commodity for each agricultural laborer increased. Actually, for each increase of a set number in the industrial labor population, there should be a corresponding increase several times this number of the population consuming the commercial food products (the populations of commerce, education, culture, building, etc), thus increasing considerably the agricultural burden. This daily increasing burden at present basically relies only on one method to solve the problem. That method relies on increasing labor density and improving the yield per unit area. Since liberation, the overall agricultural technology level has not had a revolutionary advance and agricultural labor productivity not only did not improve, on the contrary, it dropped. In 1955 the yearly output value for each agricultural laborer was 298 yuan and rose to 456 yuan in 1978. Due to a 68.8 percent rise in the purchase price of agricultural products over the 23 years, the 1978 yearly output value for agricultural labor is only 270 yuan when calculated with nonchanging prices. The productivity of agricultural labor dropped 10 percent. Under these conditions, if an increase of surplus production corresponding to past numbers is to be obtained by agricultural production then even more labor must be expended. For this reason, when we previously discussed the conditions after the two Song dynasties, we pointed out the cycle of increasing labor density to raise per mu yield which leads to a drop in labor productivity and population increases. The cycle has now greatly shortened. This also is an important reason for our second high speed population increase of 10 continuous years beginning in 1962.

The formation of the second highest period of population increase since liberation can be said to be a sign of having already begun to quicken strides toward its end under the pressure of the one-sided development of heavy industry, backward agricultural development and a rapid population increase determined by this. The so-called end is directed at the increase of labor force utilization following a population increase. The marginal productivity of agricultural labor in the end drops to be equal to the lowest average standard of living of the agricultural labor population. A graph can also be used to express this condition (see Figure 4). The marginal productivity curve,  $K(p)$ , with the horizontal and vertical axes and the area circumscribed by the perpendicular line drawn upward from the horizontal axis,  $\int_0^p K(p)$ , represents total agricultural yield. The straight line  $R$  which parallels the horizontal axis represents the agricultural labor population's lowest average standard of living. It carves out the rectangular QOPM formed of total yield, representing the total yield used to maintain the agricultural products necessary for the subsistence of the agricultural labor population. The remaining area represents that which may be used to maintain the surplus product portion of nonagricultural population subsistence. When the starting point  $Q$  on the marginal productivity curve is shifted to point  $M$  following an increase in the agricultural labor population, marginal production is equal to the lowest standard of living. At this time, the





Figure 3



Figure 4

agricultural surplus yield is equal to zero, the development of industrial production becomes impossible, and the national economy is in a state of stagnation. If the agricultural labor population is again increased, then marginal yield drops to below the lowest standard of living, in other words, the yield produced by the increased labor population is insufficient to support itself. This inevitably causes the lowest average standard of living for the entire society to also decrease. The increased population of the entire society will thus suffer the restraint of hunger and tends toward stagnation. This reflects the contradiction of backward agricultural production and its self-determined population processes. On the one hand, its development demands a relatively high speed population increase while on the other hand it, in the end, also causes continuing increases of population to become impossible. This contradiction at present has not been developed to the ultimate for our nation. If our agricultural production development and population increases are to move to that previously mentioned end, it still must follow the old path for a fairly long time. However, if the contradiction sharpens daily then the outcome is definitely beyond doubt. The drop in the marketed rate of agricultural products is evidence: in 1955 our state grain purchases were 88 billion jin, the commodity rate was 29.4 percent; state grain purchases in 1978 were 94 billion jin, however, the commodity rate was merely 18.7 percent. In a comparison of 1978 with 1965, the number of provincial areas moving out of grain production decreased from 15 to 8, the amount shifted decreased from 9.4 billion jin to 4.1 billion jin, a decrease of 5.3 billion jin; those provinces, municipalities and autonomous regions moving into grain increased from 12 to 18, the amount shifted increased from 13.1 billion jin to 19 billion jin, an increase of 5.9 billion jin.

At the end of the 1960's, the incompatible problems of population increase and increase of subsistence drew widespread attention in our nation. Due to the great stress placed on planned pregnancy after 1971 the natural population rate of increase showed a yearly tendency to decrease. By 1978 it had decreased to 1.2 percent, which is a decrease by nearly half when compared with the 2.3 percent of 1971. Such a rapid decrease is rarely seen anywhere in the world.

This has an excellent influence on our economic development. However, we also should clearly see that backwardness in agricultural production, the one basic reason for rapid population increase, still has not been overcome. Under these conditions, the increase of rural population is as fast as that in the cities. By 1978 the natural rate of increase for urban population had decreased to .88 percent and from the county level down it was 1.25 percent. Thus, through reform implementing technology in the backward agricultural industry as fast as possible, which would greatly improve agricultural labor productivity is the basis for completely solving our population problems.

#### FOOTNOTES

1. "Xin Renkou Lun" [New Populations], Ma Yinchu [7456 1377 0443]
2. "Zhongguo Shehui Zhuyi Jingji Wenti Yanjiu" [Chinese Socialist Economic Problem Research], Xue Muqiao [5641 2650 2890], p 162.
3. "Zhongguo Shehui Kexue" [China Social Science], 1980 Vol 3, pp 24-29.
4. *ibid.*
5. *ibid.*
6. *ibid.*

9795

CSO: 4005/516

## **SOCIOLOGICAL, EDUCATION AND CULTURE**

### **PLA ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN FAMILY PLANNING DESCRIBED**

Beijing GUANGMING RIBAO in Chinese 29 Mar 81 p 1

[Article: "Great Accomplishments in Planned Parenthood Throughout the PLA"]

[Text] In 1980 the PLA continued to achieve remarkable results in family planning.

In 1979 over 150,000 married officers and soldiers signed up to have only one child. Since last year, there has been a widespread strengthening of leadership in family planning throughout the army, far-reaching development of the study and propagation of the party Central Committee's "Open Letter" and "New Marriage Law" movement to control the population increase. Up to the end of last year, there were over 350,000 officers and soldiers who had received certificates for having only one child. Several units have vigorously guided large numbers of party and league members and officers and soldiers in attaching importance to the good of the people, bringing family planning into the sphere of political organizations and activities, the awarding of prizes, the choosing of activist who have learned from Lei Feng, excellent volunteer soldiers and advanced army companies.

9686

CSO: 4005/526



## PARTY AND STATE

### HONG KONG ARTICLE GIVES THREE STUDENTS' POLITICAL VIEWS

Hong Kong CH'I-SHIN NIEN-TAI [THE SEVENTIES] in Chinese No 3, 1 Mar 81 p 68-82

[Article: "Selections From the Political Views of China's New Generation of Politicians"]

[Excerpts] Editorial Note: The article "China's New Generation of Politicians," by an anonymous writer, that appeared in the previous issue of this periodical, introduced to our readers four students, Wang Juntao [3769 6511 3447], Hu Ping [5170 1627] and two others, of Beijing University, who participated in the election campaign for people's representative of Haidian District. In our article we also reported that during the election campaign they not only published an election manifesto, but also made public speeches and replied to questions from the "electorate." Each candidate also had his political views written out, mimeographed and distributed among the electorate by an election committee organized by the students themselves. The ideas expressed in their pamphlets represent the essence of political views now held by China's new generation of politicians. We are therefore publishing in this issue a part of the political comments by Wang Juntao, Hu Ping and another student candidate, Xia Shen [1115 3947], for the benefit of our readers.

Wang Juntao's long article is entitled "An Analysis of China's Past, Present and Future." Since the section "Review of the Historical Past" is very similar in viewpoint to the summing-up of the leftist trend in Chinese communism given in previous issues of this magazine and the previously published article by Wang Yizhe [3769 1585 0772], "Mao Zedong and the Great Cultural Revolution," we are reproducing here only parts of the section "Analysis of the Present." His rather original views, we believe, will evoke wide interest. It is reported that Hu Ping was officially elected people's representative of the mentioned district. His outstanding article "On Freedom of Speech" may be said to be a comprehensive discussion of the subject. It is penetrating and deep. Because the article is fairly long, we are reproducing only part of it in this issue and we intend to present the rest in a subsequent issue. On the question of how China should be reformed and from what point this reform should start, Xia Shen's views differ conspicuously from those of Hu Ping, Wang Juntao and the other election candidates. In the article we are reproducing in this issue he boldly sets forth his ideas for a total reform.

We are also reproducing the draft of a "Law on Publishing and Printing in the PRC" by Fang Zhiyuan [2075 1807 6678], an unsuccessful candidate in the primary election, and his fellow students, and the explanation that was attached to the draft in a campaign to gather signatures for its support. This law on publishing has aroused

wide interest and debate among students of Hong Kong's institutions of higher learning, who also have responded to the draft law.

All the articles were completed in November and December of last year.

**Analysis of China's Present State, by Wang Juntao: Forces Motivating and Forces Obstructing Reform**

When we embark on reform, we must not only possess a spirit of zeal and devotion, but must also make an objective assessment of all levels of Chinese society, all its factional forces, and correctly grasp the attitude these forces will take in the reform.

In the last 60 years of struggle, the CCP built up the pillars of the state for the whole nation. In the last 30 years, some of these pillars have decayed, some have degenerated and changed substantially, but some have luckily survived, and the party still has the steering wheel of the country firmly in hand. Even if they are getting old, even if they act hesitatingly, waver and even retrogress, the CCP still maintains an enthusiastic and realistic attitude of service to the country and the people and is capable of following effectively the historical trend. We oppose efforts to place the party in a position of opposition to reform. The existence of a reform faction within the CCP is a historical precondition for the Chinese nation being able to advance firmly toward the reform of its political and economic system. The party must become the vanguard for democratization.

The intelligentsia is an important force in support of reform. In the civilized society of mankind of today, science and knowledge are now drawing away from the rule of power and money, to become the guides in directing and adjusting the activities of mankind. The intelligentsia, which is daily growing in number, is more and more becoming the backbone of the society. Hatred and righteous indignation can only send people to overthrow an old society, but the building of a new society requires a clear and penetrating perception of man's true nature and of historical development. It also requires well proportioned and farsighted planning. All these qualities are undoubtedly characteristic of the intelligentsia. We can therefore state with confidence that the intelligentsia is the most progressive class of the socialist society. In the reform of the present political, economic and social structure, it is necessary for us to effect fundamental changes in the present unreasonable treatment and conditions of our country's intelligentsia, allowing them to play their social role more effectively. One part of the elderly and middle-aged intellectuals may perhaps still harbor misgivings about the present reform, but when they see the changed mode of thinking that will be required in their professions and the greater facilities for research and creative activities that the reform will bring about, they are bound to change their views and actively support the reform.

The youths will be the active element participating in the reform. Ever since the 4 May movement, they have always stood in the forefront of the struggle for reform. After having had a full taste of the agonies of deceit, despair, career disruption and unemployment, they have completely abandoned a Stalin-type or Mao Zedong-type socialism. They are striving for a socialism that recognizes the value of the human being, the significance of the human being, the rights of the human being. They yearn for the establishment of a new concept of values, a new style of life and a new pattern of society. Some have reproached the present generation of youths with being capable merely of grumbling, putting everything in doubt and with lacking any sense

of responsibility. This is unfair. The Chinese population is the youngest in the world, but the country's power structure is one of the most antiquated. Nobody listens to what the youths have to say, nobody protects their interests. The youths had to bear the blame for the mistakes of the "Cultural Revolution" and had to suffer its sequel. They were allowed no sense of being masters of their fate, so how could they acquire a sense of responsibility? It is not possible to demand that every single youth join the cause of reform, but on the whole we may say that the youths are like the one-way current in a diode--reform can freely move forward, turning back is blocked.

The peasants are the enthusiastic supporters of the present reform. Since the mid-fifties, the relations between the Chinese cities and the countryside, between workers and peasants, have not been reasonable. The peasants have suffered the hardships of the leftist line most grievously, and they are still in a state of abject poverty. After the Third Plenum, the peasants were jubilant about the change in the party's agricultural policy. The present political reform is about to raise the political status of the peasants. The economic reform will bring them many more material benefits. The reform can therefore rely on the support of the peasants.

The employees and workers are so far the main beneficiaries of the reform. The introduction of a system of bonuses and salary increases has raised their monetary income considerably. Expanded autonomy of enterprises and the institution of staff and worker representative assemblies has raised one step further their political rights and increased their material benefits. However, with the comprehensive reform of the economic structure, including the reform of the labor system, the salary and wages system, and the pricing system, we will destroy some "unbreakable ricebowls" for some. The fluctuation in commodity prices may also arouse resentment among some of them, so that possibly some local confusion or disturbances may arise. Those guiding and directing the reform must take precautionary measures, so as to avoid panic and loss of confidence in the reform.

The main force obstructing reform comes from a section of the cadres. During the democratic revolution, our party nurtured a contingent of cadres leading the peasants in the conquest of the country. After victory in our revolution, we neglected their education and readjustment. The vigilance against intellectuals and their purges cut off the source for cadre candidates. The repeated political movements under the socialist developmental pattern set by Comrade Mao Zedong inflicted continuous losses on the elite of the original cadre contingent and made into cadres a large number of citizens who only fitted that pattern. The present reform wants to break away from that pattern and establish a new pattern. It will therefore arouse resentment among many members of the present cadre contingent. It must be pointed out that the majority of them are good comrades, judging by their individual characters, but due to their personal histories, mental makeup and their personal interests, they will not be able to accept the reform and may even actively or passively resist the reform.

Even though the moving forces for reform in China are greater than the obstructing forces, the present power structure and the channels of information will make it difficult for the strength of this ratio to make itself felt. It is therefore imperative for those bent on reform to see through the outer appearances and get to the essence, and effect a profound analysis of the present social conditions.



## On Freedom of Speech, by Hu Ping

### Introduction

The purpose of this article is to assert freedom of speech; it is a unique endeavor. At a time when there is absolutely no freedom of speech, it is certainly not possible to do so. However, at a time of complete freedom of speech, it would not seem necessary to expound on it. This peculiarity often leads to a misunderstanding, that is, to the assumption that the question of freedom of speech is dependent on the will of those in power. This misunderstanding again leads to a neglect of any work or discussion of the theoretical side of this question and thus results in smothering completely any value and vitality in the principle of freedom of speech. This unfortunate misunderstanding is so deep-rooted that when this highly important and sensitive topic is brought up, many people take it to be a tiresome commonplace, the empty talk of scholarly nitwits. But when a country is without freedom of speech, the real reason is that its people lack a consciousness of freedom of speech. It is for this reason that it becomes a matter of the highest importance to clarify the inherent meaning of freedom of speech, its value and power, in the course of our work of perfecting and developing our country's socialist democracy and legal system.

### Chapter 1: The Meaning and Value of Freedom of Speech

#### 1. "Give Me a Fulcrum and I Will Move the World"

Freedom of speech for our citizens is the first article in the list of the various political rights in our constitution. If a man loses the right to make known his own aspirations and ideas, he will of necessity sink to the status of slave or a mere tool. Of course, to have the right of free speech does not mean to have everything, but losing the right of free speech will definitely lead to losing everything. In mechanics everybody knows the highly important function of the fulcrum. Even though the fulcrum itself cannot perform any work, it is indispensable to have the lever work effectively. It is said that Archimedes, the discoverer of the principle of the lever, made the statement: "Give me a fulcrum and I will move the world." In political life, isn't freedom of speech just like this fulcrum?

#### 2. The Inherent Meaning of Freedom of Speech

What is freedom of speech? It is the freedom to make known various opinions, and this includes everything: good speech, bad speech, correct speech and incorrect speech. If freedom of speech were to be limited to only the sphere outlined by those in power, then one might ask: Is there any country in the world, past and present, that did not have "freedom" of speech? In this sense, wouldn't the article of our sacred constitution on freedom of speech become a most useless piece of rubbish?

#### 3. Explanation of the Term "Freedom"

Perhaps some will refute our definition by saying it is superficial to understand freedom as suffering no restrictions; it must be understood as a knowledge of the objective inevitabilities. Freedom of speech therefore does not mean to talk all kinds of nonsense; it must obey the inevitabilities of objective developments.

One rhetorical question is sufficient to show up the flaw in the above criticism: Since, obviously, it is also undoubtedly correct that man's actions have to obey the



objective inevitabilities, why is there no article on "freedom of action" in the constitution? This shows that freedom in the concept "freedom of speech," the meaning of this term, must never be confused with and discussed as identical with that well-known philosophical proposition: freedom is knowledge of the inevitabilities. In "freedom of speech" we precisely use the term "freedom" in its simplest meaning, that is, in the meaning of being devoid of outside restrictions.

As to the common saying that every freedom has its limitations, that refers to rules inherent in the objective matter itself, and not to something imposing itself from outside. If I want to drink freely to my heart's content, my capacity for wine is a limit to such free drinking, but that does not at all influence our definition of freedom of speech.

We may point out in passing that some people consider it anarchism if "everyone is free to speak and act as he pleases." This amounts to equating freedom of speech with freedom of action. It is true that if everybody is free to do as he pleases, it may lead to a state of anarchism. However, if we extend our prohibition to preclude everybody from speaking as he pleases, that will lead to despotism. In our future opposition to any particular "ism," we must have a fairly distinct definition of it and not commit the same error as in the past when we opposed revisionism.

#### 4. About "Do Not Condemn the Speaker"

There is an ancient Chinese saying: "Do not condemn the speaker." What does it mean? Since it is only those in power who can condemn anybody else, and since those in power will of course not send their cohorts to prosecute someone who speaks the way they, the rulers, approve, it is absolutely clear that the saying "Do not condemn the speaker" especially affirms that no guilt should be attached to those who "sing a different tune." This again proves that our definition of freedom of speech given in section 3 is absolutely correct.

#### 5. Speech and Action Must Not Be Confused and Treated as Identical

Some say the rulers of any country cannot allow the fundamental institutions of their regime to be negated. It would therefore be necessary to prohibit all opposition aimed at these fundamental institutions.

This is yet another typical way of not distinguishing between speech and action. May we ask: doesn't "Das Kapital" negate the very fundamental institutions of capitalist countries? We see, in discussing political problems, that we must under no circumstances confuse, and treat as identical, speech and action.

#### 6. About Complying With the Demands of One's Duty

"But must we not comply with the demands of our basic duties as citizens?" Nothing of the sort. We must only be definitely clear about what it means to comply with the demands of our duty. Obviously, to carry out one's duties refers to actions and not to thoughts and speech. The meaning of the concept of duty is action that must be performed; if "duty" were extended to include thoughts, it would be illogical.

If anything of this nature were classified as duty, it would mean that it must be carried out no matter what attitude the individual might hold on the matter. If

personal viewpoint and prescribed matter were identical, carrying out this matter would be a matter of course, but a duty, especially one with which the individual 'id not agree, would also have to be carried out. This shows that it is necessary to determine duties, because views are not necessarily the same. In the opposite case, in instances where everybody's opinion is always completely the same, there would be no need to determine duties. In a word, determining duties means demanding uniform action although acknowledging that opinions may diverge. On the precondition that the required action is performed, the determination of duties therefore still permits people to set forth differing opinions, or even opposing opinions, with regard to the matter that has been determined as a duty. To consider the presentation of opposing views as a violation of one's duties shows a complete misunderstanding of what the term duty really means.

## 7. Criticism of the Constitution Is Also Permissible

One view of criticism perhaps needs somewhat more attention. There are people who say that freedom of speech is sacrosanct because it was inserted in the constitution, and that the constitution is of course even more sacrosanct. Although there is the right to present various opinions, it is not permissible to criticize fundamental principles of the constitution.

This kind of objection leads people into contradicting themselves: on the one hand, according to the definition of freedom of speech one cannot exclude criticism of the constitution, and on the other hand, to oppose the constitution with the provisions of the constitution is also unthinkable. Actually, the contradiction is caused by a confusion about the borderline between speech and action. If we talk about the constitution being inviolate, we have in mind action by someone. If we say objections to the constitution are permissible, we have in mind utterances by people. The law had to be enacted originally to unify the standards of action by the people, because it is necessary to have a common standard of action for the people to respect and follow, precisely because their ideas are bound to differ. The authoritative nature of the constitution is manifested in its binding force on actions of people holding different views, but it does not deny the legality of people harboring different ideas.

The principles of democracy not only demand that the minority submit to the majority, but it also demands at the same time that the right of the minority to hold a different viewpoint be protected. Any law which acknowledges the principles of democracy, including the constitution, must not reject the freedom of speech, nor restrict it. On the contrary, true freedom of speech must serve as the basis, precondition and indispensable regulator for the creation and existence of such laws, to rectify any possible mistakes, prevent abuses and to provide latitude for future improvements and development.

However, some may counter with the argument that the constitution has been generally acknowledged by the entire people, so how could we allow it to be criticized and opposed? This is a hollow argument. A principle that has been acknowledged by the entire people means that there was nobody who criticized or opposed it. If there had been a group of people, or even one single person, who raised criticism or opposition, that would clearly demonstrate that the principle had not at all received the recognition of the entire people. The problem here would still be a conflict between the opinion of the majority and that of the minority.

Actually, the constitution cannot possibly, and need not, be approved by every single citizen. Beyond that we should also consider that the constitution adopted by all the people of one generation is for the second and third generation first of all a ready made affair to which they did not give any consideration and which existed before there could even be talk of the later generations having given unanimous approval. Since it applies to them, they should have the right to give it their renewed consideration and express new ideas on it, as long as they fulfill certain duties. People can express all kinds of opinions on the constitution, including opposing viewpoints; this is a right granted by the very provisions of the constitution.

#### 8. Continuing Some of the Above

The mistaken ideas about criticism that we mentioned in the preceding paragraph have their crucial source in the lack of distinguishing between the affairs of the party and the affairs of the state and the lack of distinguishing between the significance of the party constitution and the state constitution. A member of the party has the right to criticize a certain decision of the party and certain acts of leadership in the party, and even to criticize the basic program determined by the party, because when he joined the party out of his free will, as a precondition he approved the basic program of the party constitution. So that anyone not approving the basic program of the party constitution should then also not be a member of the party. However, the relationship of the citizen to the state constitution is quite different. A person becoming a citizen under a certain social system does so in the majority of cases not as the result of a free choice. Since there had been no conscious choice, how can we force certain convictions on him? He has the duty to obey the provisions of the constitution in all his actions, but he has no responsibility to accept and approve the basic program of the constitution. If he should--only verbally--criticize and oppose the basic program of the constitution, it would not constitute a reason to deprive him of his citizen's rights. Marx very early pointed out that laws which punish certain ways of thinking are not laws that the state has promulgated for the benefit of its citizens.

And furthermore, the reason why the party member must acknowledge the basic principles of the party constitution is not only that he joined voluntarily and is free to leave the party, but also that the party constitution does not judge and sentence party members. If we were to insist on prohibiting criticism of the state constitution by the citizens, we should not only give every citizen the freedom to join or leave the state, but should also abolish the punitive function of the constitution against those who do not want to accept its basic program. In the end, no guilt should be attached to those who speak out. It would be as good as making the state constitution into a party constitution and turning the state into the party. The result would necessarily be that in order to harmonize the relationship between those who acknowledge the basic program of the state constitution and those who do not, we would be forced to draw up a new set of agreements which would then deal only with actions but not with ways of thinking. This would in fact amount to enacting another state constitution. This constitution would be a constitution in the true sense, and the earlier constitution that punished ways of thinking would then no longer be applicable.

#### 9. There is a Distinct Borderline Between Speech and Action

There is a distinct borderline between speech and action. This point must be emphasized again and again. Some people consider public speeches and publication of articles as actions. This is obviously nothing but sophistry.



## 10. On the Crimes of Frameups, Slander and Incitement

Only if speech is directly linked with action, can speech turn into a criminal act. The so-called frameups, slander and incitement are of this nature.

## 11. Refutation of So-Called "Bourgeois Freedom of Speech"

We have already clarified the precise meaning of freedom of speech. The only thing we could be blamed for is that people may criticize us for advocating a "bourgeois freedom of speech". It appears easy to reply to this criticism because the critics themselves cannot state clearly what they call "bourgeois freedom of speech" and what they call "proletarian freedom of speech".

So-called "bourgeois freedom of speech" may possibly refer to the following two conditions: 1) freedom that allows only the bourgeoisie to speak, and 2) freedom to state only opinions that do not violate the fundamental interests of the bourgeoisie. The former limits the identity of those who want to speak out, and the latter determines the nature of what may be stated. But conditions like this could only be called "unfreedom" of speech and not "bourgeois freedom of speech". Everybody knows that neither of the two conditions exist in the countries with bourgeois democratic systems. Since this is so, is there any basis for talking of "proletarian freedom of speech" in contrast to "bourgeois freedom of speech"?

Viewed from the standpoint of a person with even only a small idea of what a modern state should be, the oppression by those in power over those that dissent is a most brutal misuse of power, even though these persons may firmly oppose the viewpoint of those that dissent. However, viewed from the standpoint of people who have been too deeply influenced by feudal autocracy, the oppression of dissenters by the rulers is a most natural and necessary course of action within the limits of their rights. Even in cases where they might secretly completely agree with the viewpoint of the oppressed, the oppressors will affirm that their kind of oppression is "reasonable." The lamentable thing is that many comrades in their minds have not the slightest understanding of the fact that every kind of power needs controls. They absolutely do not understand what is called the rights of citizens. They do not understand that the power of government must only be used to protect the rights of its citizens and must under no circumstances be used to infringe on the rights of the citizens. Some people even go so far as to give their naive viewpoints Marxist labels, and use ambiguous and confused formulations instead of carrying out penetrating analyses of complex matters. On the one hand they don't understand very well what is bourgeois, and on the other hand they apply the term bourgeois to everything that they don't understand. So-called bourgeois freedom of speech and proletarian freedom of speech, these fabrications, are nothing but typical manifestations of their singular stupidity.

## 12. The Deceptiveness of Bourgeois Democracy

How then are we to recognize the deceptiveness of bourgeois democracy? We must realize that democracy is, exactly as Lenin expressed it, a kind of state form. What determines the real substance of a state is its economic structure, its production relations, in short its system of ownership of the means of production. The deceptiveness of bourgeois democracy consists in its using the form to conceal the substance. There is the famous saying by the progressive French writer France which



bitterly reveals this point; he said: "Our laws are equal, our millionaires and our beggars are equally forbidden to sleep under the bridges." Judging from outer forms, the workers and the capitalists in countries with bourgeois democracy enjoy the same political rights; however, in substance, due to the exploitation suffered by the workers under the capitalist production method, there is no true and firm material guarantee of their political rights. An unemployed worker has no way to enter the campaign for the presidency, although in name he has the right to do so.

In the democratic system, all basic principles, such as freedom of speech, cannot in themselves be divided into "bourgeois" and "proletarian". In certain outer forms, the bourgeois and the proletarian democratic systems are very similar; otherwise, why should both be called democratic systems? It is only because of the completely different economic base on which they rely that one is called a bourgeois democratic system and the other a proletarian democratic system. Furthermore, certain democratic principles, such as freedom of speech, have admittedly been gained and spread as a consequence of the bourgeois revolution, but they are by nature spiritual assets of all mankind, they are the excellent fruits of mankind's cultural progress. We must not humbly hand over this heritage to the bourgeoisie. In actual fact, we made it one of the tasks of our struggle at the time of the democratic revolution to gain freedom of speech. As soon as new China was established, we wrote freedom of speech into the republic's constitution without the least hesitation, which shows that freedom of speech as such is a correct principle. Let us not forget that when Marx first stepped on the political stage, two or more of his early articles dealt with freedom of speech and freedom of the press. It is true that at that time he was not yet a Marxist, but without 1842 there would have been no 1847. (Note: in 1842 Marx published his article on freedom of the press; in 1847 he published his "Communist Manifesto".) Merely upholding the viewpoint of freedom of speech and going no further, of course, does not make one a Marxist. However, if a person has not even reached this stage, or even opposes freedom of speech, he qualifies even less as a Marxist.

After all, Marxism was produced in the capitalist West. The Chinese intellectuals, deeply influenced by Eastern feudal autocratic thinking, often easily understand and accept that part of the theory that criticizes and negates Western culture, but they do not easily understand and accept that part which is traditional and positive. Even today, 30 years after the establishment of our republic, we are still forced to carry out repeated mopping-up operations against feudal autocratic thought. Is this serious lesson not sufficient to awaken us to the need to start out from a more comprehensive viewpoint in our efforts to gain a better understanding of Marxism?

### 13. Freedom of Speech Is Not the Widening of Access of Public Opinion as Practiced in a Feudal Society

As mentioned in the preceding section, the principle of freedom of speech gained deep and widespread propagation mainly through the bourgeois revolution. Since China never went through a stage of highly developed capitalism, many Chinese were left without an understanding of the true meaning of freedom of speech. In actual fact, in the understanding of some of our comrades, democracy is nothing but an enlightened autocracy. Freedom of speech, as they understand it, is not different from the submitting and accepting of remonstrances and widening access for public opinion to reach the ruler, as practiced in feudal society. We must point this out here.

The system of remonstrating practiced in feudal society was not truly freedom of speech, because the sphere of what might be stated by ministers or the people was actually decided by the will of the emperor or king. Due to differences in historical conditions and in the character of the rulers, this sphere at times was somewhat wider and at times extremely narrow. However, in any case, there were these limitations. The existence of freedom of speech in a country does not depend on whether the rulers are willing to lend an ear and will tolerate critical opinions, but on whether the rulers have the power to punish those who hold opposing views.

There have been emperors and kings who may have shown leniency and tolerance toward critical or even certain opposing views, whether because they wanted to attract talent, or due to anxieties in the early stages of their rule, or due to some concern for the opinion of future generations, or due to a generosity and bigheartedness at the height of their glory, but to call this kind of attitude freedom of speech would be making a mistake about the substance of the matter. It is nothing else but an enlightened autocracy. If certain emperors and kings used their power in a more enlightened and wiser way, it does not change the nature of unlimited power in the hands of the feudal rulers, and it does not mean that the people already enjoyed the right of free speech that could not at any time be taken away from them. This kind of enlightened autocracy was always the exception in the long existence of feudal society. Furthermore, such periods were always the result of the bankruptcy of a preceding regime of extreme autocracy, and at the same time they always paved the way for the advent of another period of extreme autocracy. No matter how high the kite flies, it is not free, because one end of the string is in the hands of the person who controls it. No matter how broad the road of access under an autocracy, it was not freedom, because the power to control speech was in the hands of the emperor or king.

True freedom of speech exists only when the rulers do not have the power to punish dissenters, only when the right to free speech exists independent of whether it enjoys the protection of an enlightened ruler, and only when the people have learned to resist power in its attempts to interfere with free speech.

#### 14. Comrade Mao Zedong's Statements Concerning Freedom of Speech

Comrade Mao Zedong has made many correct expositions on the question of freedom of speech. Here we intend to quote some of these statements as evidence in order to attract greater attention.

Comrade Mao Zedong pointed out that one should allow people to talk. If people are allowed to talk, it will not bring down the heavens. As long as they do not violate discipline, do not organize secret gangs, everyone will be allowed to talk. If they say things that are wrong, they still must not be punished. We are not restricting talk to only one man's opinion, but will allow the masses to have their say. We want to have everyone say all he knows and say it without reserve. The speaker must not be blamed, but his words must be taken as warning. We want to follow the "three-no principle" of no more seizing of people in queues, putting caps of shame on people, and hitting people with sticks. He clearly pointed out that even people who made statements against the party and against socialism should be granted freedom of speech, as long as they did not commit acts of sabotage. Eradicating poisonous weeds in the ideological field is one thing, but punishing people is another. There are many more of his statements in this vein. He furthermore gave explanations for

the implementation of these principles. However, the sad thing is that it has not been possible in all these years to implement the principles, for reasons of theoretical confusion and for psychological reasons. This is well worth pondering.

The greatest theoretical confusion arose by refusing freedom of speech to reactionaries and at the same time declaring that people who publish reactionary statements are reactionaries. In the following we shall explain that this way of arguing is actually arguing in a logical circle. It will necessarily lead to a situation of "might is truth." For many years, good and honest Chinese have engaged in the foolishness of killing each other, the entire political and cultural life suffered an unprecedented calamity, and in all this the above-quoted specious logic played a primary role. It actually became a central issue in the argument for freedom of speech to criticize and defeat this fallacy.

The psychological reason was the so-called "rightist-scars syndrome." By carefully observing these people in China's political life, one quickly detects the following peculiar phenomenon: Certain statements by Comrade Mao Zedong, whether only a few words or bits of phrases, were ardently venerated as divine, and even to doubt them would be considered treason and heresy. On the other hand, certain statements, even though they were repeated injunctions, were completely ignored, and even discussing them would bring down a calamity on your own head. In general, phrases that were somewhat "leftist" or that could be conveniently adduced to demonstrate one's own "revolutionary firmness," met the fate of the former, and statements that were nearer the middle and could be counterattacked by people as showing a "questionable political stand," were of the latter kind. The "instruction from the highest authority" to "struggle by reasoning and not to engage in armed struggle" could not prevent total internal disorder. The spirit of "Don't blame the speaker" could not reduce the huge number of "ideological criminals" and "speech criminals." On the question of freedom of speech there is not clarity even to this day, and people still cannot decide which of the two views is correct. There are also still people who publish proposals which advocate, against their own convictions, keeping speech fettered, which inevitably recalls Andersen's tale of the emperor's clothes. People are afraid to be called fools and would rather not trust their own eyes. In our place people are afraid of being called "of unstable political stand" if they rely on their own intelligence. History has proven without exception that apart from cases of invasion by an overly strong enemy, national calamities were brought about to some extent by the people's own actions, and that purposely going against the call of one's own reason is the curtainraiser of tragedy. We only hope that in the future we will not follow the same old disastrous road.

#### 15. We Must Clarify Freedom of Speech to the Fullest Extent

There are two objectives in quoting authoritative statements: 1) to prove that a certain argument is derived from a certain authority, or to prove it was first affirmed by a certain authority, and 2) to use the standing of one's authority in order to arouse the serious attention of one's opponent to the point in question. However, to quote an authority is not necessarily a substitute for a statement based on reason. We should not, and must not, merely count on the name of our authority and convince our opponent only because of his admiration for that name. In short, an authority is not the same as evidence. In the question of freedom of speech, we must therefore adduce further evidence. This is not at all a superfluous act of tilting at windmills. In fact, this is a most realistic and most urgent theoretical task. We know we'll find that there are quite a number of people, among them some clever brains in



responsible positions, who in their hearts take exception to freedom of speech. There are some among those who favor freedom of speech who possibly do not fully understand the theoretical base and the practical foundation on which this principle rests. Finally, among those who fervently approve of freedom of speech there are some who may not necessarily realize clearly its invincible nature, that is, the source of its strength. For this reason in the future we will give much attention to all considerations of others and make every effort to give an exhaustive and complete exposition, to clarify any possible confusion, and to convince all possible opponents in our debate. This will definitely result in a lengthy article, but in view of the serious significance of this problem, the reader will perhaps have the patience to read it to the end. When we consider our objective, namely that we and future generations will never again be threatened by the terror of being punished for speaking out, and that we want to remove completely this evil mountain that weighs heavily on the spirit of the Chinese people, we actually fear that we are too brief in our discourse and not thorough enough.

#### 16. Speech Is Not Target for Punitive Laws

First of all, speech is not a target for punitive laws. This is the first reason for the implementation of freedom of speech. During a certain period of our past, we deprived certain people of the right of free speech. That was done because they had exploited and oppressed other people, or because they had committed acts of sabotage that were against the law, but certainly not because of their speech or thoughts. The law can punish only outwardly apparent actions. Marx pointed out: "Any law that does not aim at the action itself, but takes a person's way of thinking as the main criterion, is no more than public approval of an illegal act." "As far as law is concerned, apart from my actions, I do not exist; I am not at all a target of the law. My actions are the only area in which I have any contact with the law. It is by my actions that I claim my right to exist, the only means of asserting my rights, and furthermore the only factor by which I am controlled by the laws in force." He also pointed out that any law which prosecutes inclinations, that is, a law which "wants to punish what I think and ignores my actions," is "a kind of slur on the reputation of citizens; it is a treacherous pitfall that threatens my existence." Experience tells us that laws which punish thought actually consider every citizen as criminally suspect. A man may earnestly and seriously pursue the truth, but he cannot preclude the possibility of falling prey to fallacies. He may be careful in his actions, but he must show courage in his thinking. Some say ideological liberation has no forbidden zones but has limiting borders. These people have forgotten that ideas as such have no limiting borders, much as the universe. If you discover limits, that means you have already gone beyond this kind of limit. These people have forgotten that recognition of the limiting borderline means that you want to reflect on both sides of the borderline. In other words, we must reflect on what should not be reflected upon. All kinds of principles, whether right or wrong, must only be conclusions of reflections and cannot be a priori commandments. A law that punishes thought tries to delineate borderlines for thinking, which in itself is a contradiction. Its results can only be an ossification and stifling of ideas. So-called "abiding by the law," that is, keeping your actions within legal bounds, is something that can be accomplished. But how can one demand that a person think within legally determined bounds? How can one possibly prohibit people from thinking certain thoughts? Thoughts are free, they cannot but be free. "I think" means "I think what I want to think." "I think what I think" means "I think whatever I want to think." This cannot even be mentioned in the same breath as "I do whatever I think of doing."



Every action results from a certain thought, but not every thought necessarily leads to a certain action. There is the old saying: "Think thrice before you act." Speech is the outer manifestation of thought; it is not necessarily always a signal for action. The more fully man uses the language tool to freely interchange ideas, the better his ability to arrive at a correct understanding and at a more reasonable and wiser action. It follows that suppressing speech often does not prevent mistaken action, but rather prevents action based on careful thought and consideration. Its result is bound to be that if the pressure is sufficiently strong, people will be dispirited and passive, and if the pressure weakens, people will engage in willful disturbances. That means that restricting free speech does not necessarily restrict action, but it will restrict ideas. Strictly speaking, it restricts the interchange of ideas, the maturing of ideas, the development of ideas, and as a result strangles reason.

Since the punishment of speech is not the punishment of actions but the punishment of thoughts, there must be a determination of what kind of thought is criminal. If reactionary thought is sufficient grounds for punishment, why only take openly expressed speech as grounds for punishment? Why not put hidden microphones into every household? Why not open and check all private letters? Inspect all private diaries? And besides, certain thoughts can at times also be expressed by the tone of voice, by facial or other expression, or even by silence. Why then not also punish "illegal crying," "laughter with certain hidden meaning" and a "reactionary stone silence"? Indeed all these disgraceful fascist acts have occurred and have been perpetrated under the banner of all-out dictatorship, because they really logically evolve from the punishment of thought. All these crowning successes of evil are nothing but the tail of that lizard "criminal thought." As long as we want to preserve the body of "criminal thought," its tail, even if cut off repeatedly, will always grow back. No wonder young Marx was so infuriated by the idea of "criminal thought."

At the same time, speech cannot be checked as easily after it has been uttered as an action can be checked, unless the speech has been made visible in writing. In the past few years the cases of miscarriage of justice, when someone was accused of having said something but somebody else was sentenced instead, have been so numerous that even though the tables were turned on the accusers, we still cannot get a clear idea whether these were cases of false accusations, and the only result is that the number of cases of miscarriage of justice are constantly being increased.

Perhaps some of those who want to uphold the punishment of speech might say: we will attach importance to evidence, we will oppose illegal checks on the private lives of people, we only want to punish those who have been actually proven to have made reactionary speeches in public. It is true that this would arouse less resentment, but the reasons they use as a basis for saying this, if considered in their true light, are doubly hateful. First of all, if there were a reactionary ideological trend that made it necessary to institute autocratic rule, it would be complete dereliction of duty to abstain from supervision and investigation of the private life of individuals. Next, if this method were employed, we would be punishing not all the persons guilty of reactionary thought, but only those who willingly expressed their reactionary viewpoint publicly and responsibly. We would punish the good and honest and let off the crafty and tricky ones. We would punish those who to some extent still believe in us and let off those who are completely hostile to us. We would be punishing those who still want to argue with reason and therefore are still

able to acknowledge the truth and would let off those who absolutely refuse any debate. In fact, we would encourage people to plot and scheme and we would instigate people to adopt a two-faced attitude. Does this not deserve to be even more emphatically condemned?

#### 17. Even If Speech Were Punished, the Criteria Would Be Impossible To Determine

Next, punishment of speech would encounter another difficulty which would be impossible to solve, namely the question of determining criteria. To give attention to these criteria would not be a matter of distinguishing between right and wrong, but of distinguishing between ourselves and the enemy. The "Six-Article Standards" obviously do not suit the purpose. Furthermore, these criteria would be legal criteria, to be applied in measuring out punishment, and therefore could not be adopted from the loosely defined political criteria. In other words, we would have to insure that violations of these criteria were committed with distinct counterrevolutionary intent. We would also have to insure that these criteria were not interpreted in different ways.

The determination of these criteria would have two choices. One way would be to have them tend toward the rigid and definite, and the other would be to have them tend toward the flexible and comprehensive. The former way would strictly adhere to words, the latter would look at the general tendency. Unfortunately, neither method is of any use.

According to the first consideration we would explicitly determine which words would be prohibited, so that their use would constitute a counterrevolutionary act. The advantage of this method would be that no divergent interpretations would be possible, and thus the misuse of power and the occurrence of cases of trumped-up false charges and miscarriage of justice would be avoided. The disadvantages would be excessive rigidity and opportunity for people to exploit loopholes, which would almost completely wreck their functioning as a prohibition. Human speech is rich in variations and extremely subtle. Avoiding the taboo of certain words and evading the obstacle of certain phrases would still permit people to express their ideas just as before. Different phrases can communicate an identical idea; identical phrases can bring about different reactions. If we were to adopt this method of determining criteria, our efforts would be doomed to failure.

The second method also would not stand close scrutiny. A criterion that would consider general tendencies in itself could not be concrete and definite. It would require a faculty of understanding on the part of the person applying the criteria that would in the end lead to punishment at the discretion of a single person and abolish punishment according to law. Everybody knows that ambiguous and equivocal law is not worthy of the name. If people who sincerely uphold the law can give all kinds of different interpretations to one and the same law, that law is rendered ineffective.

It is already a proven fact that the overwhelming majority of the frighteningly large number of cases of frameups, false accusations and miscarriages of justice during the past 20 years came about through the prosecution of speech as a crime. The serious consequences of these mistakes far surpass what is imagined. There is an ancient saying; "Punish one and warn one hundred," which is no longer true today, when the killing of one can in fact warn a thousand, ten thousand, or even more. In the

Tienanmen Square incident, only some 300 or so people were mistakenly arrested, which is less than one three-millionth the total Chinese population of 1 billion, and that was enough to cause a white terror of nationwide proportions! What lesson must we draw from our past mistakes? At least this one: never again should punishment be meted out for speech as a crime.

#### 18. Continuation

However, a minority of people do not look at it that way. They say all we have to do in future is merely to take care to make stricter distinctions. One does not know whether to laugh or cry over such an argumentation. Does this not amount to saying, the reason why so many cases of frameups, false accusations and miscarriages of justice occurred was because at that time people did not, subjectively, "differentiate strictly enough"? It is true that whatever the job, it is always hard to avoid making mistakes, and one must not shirk work for fear of making mistakes. However, punishing speech as a crime does not belong in this category. Punishment of speech as a crime is not what the revolution needs. Abolishing punishment of speech as a crime does not mean that we give up the ideological struggle. There is the saying, "3,000 enemies killed, 800 of our men wounded." In a revolutionary undertaking it is not uncommon to suffer certain losses among one's own fighters. But there are two kinds of losses here: one is getting killed in frontline fighting and the other is getting killed somewhere else by a sniper's shot.

But how can it be still justified if the heroes at the front charge the enemy, and only because of a slight suspicion that maybe some bad elements might be among them, are strafed with a merciless salvo from their own camp in the rear?

#### 19. Punishment of Speech as a Crime is Incompatible With the Legitimate Meaning of Criminal Justice

There are some who strongly advocate punishment of speech as a crime while hardly giving any thought to the meaning of such punishment. We might as well make a brief analysis of it in this section, as possibly helpful in strengthening our argument that no guilt should be attached to those who speak out. In general, punishment has the following functions: compensation, reform, isolation, deterrence to potential criminals.

Paying with one's life for murder, paying a fine for embezzlement, are instances of compensation, but compensation is always exacted in the same kind (except where nothing of equal kind exists). According to this logic, compensation for one kind of speech should be in another kind of speech. Since this is so, a country where opinions can be freely expressed will permit criticism and also criticism of criticism, and there would be no grounds to exact compensation by any other means. Seizing people and incarcerating them for having said certain things obviously does not serve the purpose of compensation. We see therefore that there is no justification under the aspect of compensation for punishment of speech as a crime.

Regarding reform, speech is a problem of thought which can only be solved by convincing. By punishing someone and forcing him into submission you cannot truly change a man's conceptions. We must bear in mind that the theory of reform is based on gaining one's purpose by changing the bad environment or lifestyle to bring about a transformation in the way of thinking. It is therefore a method that only applies



to people who live in a bad environment, or have a bad lifestyle which is apt to create bad thoughts. It is absolutely senseless in the case of someone who works in a regular job and lives a regular life, but merely harbors a differing view.

As to isolation, due to the fact that the speech has already been made and has gained an independent existence, punishment can only isolate the speaker and not the thought that has already been expressed by him. If a viewpoint is rejected by the masses, there is no need to isolate the speaker. If the viewpoint is accepted by the masses, isolation of the speaker is useless. Some say that isolation of the speaker can prevent the further development and spread of certain ideas and is therefore still justified. However, erroneous ideas are not like poison gas or bullets; they cannot by themselves do harm to people's conceptions. Unless a person finds a certain viewpoint reasonable, this viewpoint will have not the slightest influence on him. This is especially the case because the viewpoints we are dealing with here are "unorthodox" viewpoints that are not in any controlling position; they lack all power to force anyone to pay attention to them or to accept them. If a viewpoint that finds itself in such a disadvantageous position is still capable of attracting the attention of others, it must be that people have subjected it to a careful comparison with the official view and have become genuinely convinced of the superiority of the former. This is always a sign that the viewpoint contains some fresh truths. In other words, one need not guard against the spread of truly absurd statements, while ideas that can conquer the minds of people, unless they are suppressed, are more often than not correct ideas.

Of course, some people will say that the majority of people are always full of curiosity, and their attention is easily attracted by any unorthodox viewpoint. However, we would say to that: only in an atmosphere where one person's opinion is made to dominate exclusively will people display a particular and extraordinary interest in any kind of dissenting viewpoint. As long as various viewpoints can be freely expressed, people will not give attention to the opposing viewpoints. One must realize that those viewpoints which exercise influence by relying on people's curiosity were born under the prerequisite of lacking opportunities for normal expression. Once people become accustomed to seeing opposing views published, their curiosity about them will disappear. It is therefore good sense if some people point out that the suppression of opposing views is more often than not making counterpropaganda on behalf of the suppressed viewpoints.

Furthermore, the intention of preventing the spread of opposing views is nothing but forbidding the people to accept erroneous views, and as such it proceeds from the standpoint of a guardian, while the masses are taken for imbeciles, and from the standpoint of the "official acting as father and mother of the people," while the masses are taken for little children. Under the best of conditions, this will merely nurture people with one-track minds and give rise to a dogmatism that is not fit to exist in this world. Some people might possibly say that we should indeed let the masses have contact with certain opposite matters in order to strengthen their immunity to such matters, but everything must be selected by us, and at the same time we will still have to arrest those who express those opposing views. However, if they select such teaching material on things not to do or to follow in order to raise the power of discernment among the masses, and in advance stamp the material "to be criticized and rebutted," then their praiseworthy intentions are almost impossible to achieve. Reading a man's writing for the sole purpose of refuting his views cannot be of the slightest benefit. It would be like attending an intricate



antiespionage film and telling the audience in advance who the spy is. This would not help the audience improve their reasoning power, and the result would be even worse if at the same time we arrested the author of the opposing viewpoint. It would not inspire the people to distinguish between correct and incorrect ideas, but would actually warn people what to think and what to say, what thought is not permitted and what statement is not permitted. This is not part of any emancipation of the mind, but rather the establishment of forbidden zones. It is not increasing knowledge but suppressing reason. Instituting a policy of isolation will therefore not only of necessity suppress the truth, but will furthermore of necessity bring about a decline in the intelligence of the broad masses of the people.

Actually, there are some people who favor a kind of "well-intentioned" policy of keeping the people in ignorance, based on what they claim to be a desire to do what is best for the people. These men would work with all their strength to keep the people ignorant by controlling their thoughts. In order to maintain the purity of the people's thoughts, they would rather have the people remain simple-minded. As a consequence the society would become stagnant and have a dull rigidity, or at least make extremely slow progress. This kind of impoverished, drab, static form of society is in some people's minds perhaps the "ideal state." However, the people in general would not like this society, and furthermore it would be certainly and mercilessly eliminated in today's world with its high-speed changes and rapid developments.

Finally, let us examine again whether punishment of speech as a crime would deter potential criminals. If this were truly the motivation, it would amount to tacitly approving the following points: 1. Those in power are considered the only sanctified ones who may regard anyone criticizing them as a "criminal". 2. The policies pursued by those in power are not only regarded as definitely correct, in fact the only correct ones, but it can be assumed that everyone else, quite spontaneously, has unswerving faith in this correctness; in other words, the views of those in power are innate, heaven-endowed views. Anyone, therefore, who reflects on or doubts such dogma, or subjects it to further exploration and discussion, coming out with a different or opposite opinion, is of necessity a person who nurses evil intentions, harbors dark designs and shows no repentance. There is therefore no choice but to impose stiff sentences on such people, thus terrorizing and threatening them. 3. Those in power recognize that a considerable number of people oppose them, or at least they believe that if opposing views were freely expressed it is quite likely that this would bring about a considerable opposition. It is therefore necessary to have the potential enemies feel the terror, thus following the principle of "killing one to warn a hundred." 4. Those in power have no self-confidence that they could successfully win over the minds of the people if a discussion were held with those holding opposing views. For that reason they adopt methods which do not promote reason but block it. The main point here is that their terror is brought to bear on speech and thought as targets, so that there is absolutely no possibility for them to prove that they themselves are correct. If anyone in power suppresses an action, how can it be determined whether the suppression is justified? Perhaps by judging from the number of pros and cons. But if that which is suppressed is not an action, but a certain viewpoint, there is no way to prove its correctness. All dissenters are regarded as potential criminals or accomplices; they are truly seen as "the monkeys who are being frightened by having to witness the killing of chickens." Only those who agree can freely express their views. Under these preconditions, deliberate misrepresentation, "calling a stag a horse," is the easiest thing to do. It is true that this kind of terror can sometimes indeed consolidate the position of those in

power, but this is achieved not by broadening the trust and loyal devotion of the broad masses, but on the contrary, by increasing their estrangement from the people and the hostility of the people toward themselves. This policy may perhaps be necessary for those regimes that are determined to remain the enemies of the people, even though its effect is like "drinking poison to quench a thirst." However, for a regime that sincerely and truly has the interests of the people at heart, these methods are extremely harmful, even though at certain times they may after all seem acceptable as emergency measures to "cut a tangled skein of hemp with a sharp knife."

In sum, we see that punishing speech as a crime is quite different from punishing a criminal act, and that it has no theoretical foundation whatsoever.

(to be continued)

What To Do? Outline of Overall Reform and Discussion With Other Candidates, Xia Shen

### 1. Starting Out From Different Theories on Reform; Extricating Ourselves From Arguing in a Circle

As to how to carry out the reform, one proposal is to take freedom of speech as the point of departure. "Without freedom of speech, there can't be anything else." The reason for the lack of freedom of speech is mainly seen in the lack of consciousness on the part of the people, and one way to raise their consciousness is to require freedom of speech. This is a small circle, which does not discuss the source of the problem, the actual political and economic system. It is therefore also not an answer that will solve this problem. Another viewpoint has it that reform must take liberation of thinking as its point of departure. "Liberation of thinking must precede reform." People of a different viewpoint may say: thinking belongs to the realm of ideology and is conditioned by the economic foundation. Without an economic reform, there certainly cannot be an extensive and penetrating liberation of thinking. Other people, who hold that the point of departure must be political reform, may propound the view that politics is the concentrated expression of economics, so that it is only possible to reform and promote the economic foundation by first reforming the political system to the extent that it does not suit the economic foundation. The proponents of the liberation of thinking may also say that all reforms are carried out by men and are guided by ideas, so that thought occupies the top position; reform has to begin at the top. And finally the argument starts all over again in another circle.

I propose an overall reform that would abandon the dogmatism of textbooks and extricate us from arguing in a circle.

### 2. Starting Out From the Subject of the Reform--Everything For Man

Reform starts and is moved on by man, and the goal and purpose of reform is also man. Every real Chinese, the broad masses of workers and peasants, the intellectuals and generally all cadres, suffer in varying degrees from certain social oppressions. They yearn in economic respects for material benefits, in political respects for democratic rights, in ideological respects for freedom of development. Their demands are comprehensive, and a comprehensive development can be realized only in a comprehensive social reform, an overall modernization--economic modernization, political democratization, and ideological modernization.

### 3. Starting Out From the Target of the Reform--Break up of the "Three Forming One Organic Whole" Development

Ours is a system of highly centralized state power covering politics, economics and ideology. This is an obstacle to the further development of the productive force and of man's well-being. It is the deep source of such social maladies as bureaucratism, lack of real freedom of speech, repression of thought, etc. If we want social progress, we must dissolve the centralization. The democratic reform of this "Three Forming One Organic Whole" is the reform of politics, economics and ideology. Starting out from only one aspect alone to reform the system of centralized state power, the "Three Forming One Organic Whole," is not only contrary to reason but in actual practice is also bound to fail.

### 4. Starting Out From Eastern and Western Systems--Historical Choice

The Soviet Union started economic reforms in the sixties, but even to this day it still maintains a political totalitarianism and ideological autocracy. Sakharov, the father of the H-bomb, was sent into exile because of his dissenting political views. Our yesterday is the Soviet Union's day before yesterday; we only wish our today would not be as their yesterday and our tomorrow, not as their today. On the other hand, in the West there are democratic regimes with seemingly sufficient liberty and freedom of expression; whether it is Marx's "Das Kapital" or Sweezy's "Monopoly Capital," all can be published and sold. However, the working class still suffers suppression and exploitation by the capitalists, and the economic relations have not yet changed. Political democracy and ideological freedom therefore have considerable limitations, and man's personal development may still suffer suppression; unemployment, the crisis in morality, etc., are proof of this. Some knowledgeable men in the West already realize that the lopsided development of the material civilization has brought human society face to face with an incongruous state of extreme spiritual emptiness. As a nation still in the process of development, China has the possibility of blazing a new trail for a high civilization of human society. The hope of China, and also that of mankind, is bound up with this prospect. We can learn from the experiences of the West and the East and choose a new way conforming to the demand for a comprehensive development of man. Overall reform leads to the road of comprehensive development of man. Our present productive force is certainly not below the level of the Renaissance in Western Europe, or of Yugoslavia at the time of instituting its democratic self-government. Why should we not propose an overall modernization and right from the start carry out a comprehensive reform?

### 5. Starting Out From Chinese History--A New Juncture

Beginning with the long-drawn-out historical development of feudal society, we see politics and ideology merged into one centralized state power based on a small-scale peasant economy, with the effect that every instance of political reform (the uprisings of lower strata or the changes of political institutions by the upper strata) failed to change the structure of Chinese society. This shows the stability of the merged entity as well as its backwardness. At that time there were only two components in the entity. Today there are three components in the entity, based on state ownership (state-operated economy) and quasistate ownership (collective economy). Reform of one aspect alone will not only not lead to overall reform, but will even turn back comprehensive reform to the original state of things. The steel-smelting of 1958 was a complete failure, the cultural revolution made political revolution and completely abandoned production. In the last 4 years the "four modernizations"



were raised to the "highest form of politics," the liberation of the mind went back and forth and did not get very deep, but the reform of the political system was put on the agenda only 3 months ago. The lessons of history should enlighten people somewhat more to the effect that without an intention to reform the entire system, there will be no comprehensive reform. The reform and the replacement of the old social structure can be gradually accomplished only if the new economic element can find representative expression in the political and ideological attitudes, and the new elements in politics and ideology can also have new economic factors as the basis.

The choice is to have its conclusion, but the investigation and exploration will always continue. Now our nation faces the opportunity to make a choice of its future; let anyone who is concerned about the fate of our fatherland and of mankind join hands with us and let us make the reform and development of society our lifetime mission. Let us forever investigate, explore, struggle.

8453

CSO: 4005/538

END



**END OF**

**FICHE**

**DATE FILMED**

6/5/81

---